

REMARKS

Claims 2-12, 14-16 and 18-24 were pending and stand rejected. Claims 2 and 18 have been canceled, and claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 12, 19, 20, and 23 have been amended. Following entry of the amendments, claims 3-12, 14-16, and 19-24 will be pending and at issue.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 18-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. During the interview on November 20, 2006, the Examiner indicated that the claims satisfied § 101 without amendment.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e)

Claims 2-12, 14-16, 18-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,009,442). Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection. Applicants have canceled claims 2 and 18 and amended claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 12, 19, 20, 23. However, these claims have not been canceled or amended as a result of the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

The claimed invention describes methods and systems of generating templates and using templates to extract information from various articles. In one embodiment, this would allow the extracted information to be stored in a database where it could be searched, presented, and processed more efficiently than the original documents. As an example, a user could search the information in the database by variable data, such as artist, title, description and price.

Chen is directed toward something very different from the claimed invention. Chen concerns a document management system for categorization and management of electronic and/or paper based documents. Chen seeks to link an STG file from a document to a folder based on common attributes.

With regard to amended claims 12, 14 and 23, at least the following limitations are not present in Chen:

- identifying a plurality of templates each comprising at least one information field;
- comparing a source article to the templates to determine a closest template;
- associating data from the source article with an information field from the closest template; and
- extracting the associated data

Chen simply does not discuss a “plurality” of templates, let alone the determination of a “closest” template. Chen also does not mention associating data from an article with an information field from the closest template or extracting that data after it has been associated.

Because Chen does not contain each element of the claims as amended, the rejection of claims 3-12, 14-16, and 19-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Since claims 3-11 are dependent on claim 12, claims 15-16 are dependent on claim 14, and claims 19-22 and 24 are dependent on claim 23, all arguments advanced above with respect to claims 12, 14, and 23 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to these dependent claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record and request that the Examiner allow this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

CRAIG NEVILL-MANNING, ET AL.

Dated: December 5, 2006

By: /Brenda M. Simon/

Brenda M. Simon
Reg. No. 48,449
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7198
Fax.: (650) 938-5200